DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 278 VT 010 923

AUTHOR	Tallant, Kyle M.; And Others
TITLE	Tampa Federal Offender Rehabilitation. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Vocational Rehabilitation.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 69
NOTE	54p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjustment Counselors, *Correctional Rehabilitation, *Criminals, *Demonstration Projects, Tables (Data), *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS	Florida, *Tampa

ABSTRACT

Vocational rehabilitation counselors were assigned on a full-time basis to the Federal Probation Office in Tampa, Florida, to work with probationers and releasees as soon as the case files were received in the probation office. This 3-year project was part of a cooperative research program conducted in seven states. A total of 247 offenders ranging in age from 17 to 53 were selected for the Tampa program and randomly placed in one of three groups. Experience with the project showed that as work continued with the client, he lost his antagonistic and mythical hardness and emerged as an individual in need of help. It was found that the counselor had to have considerable time flexibility and be able to intervene with the offender during crisis periods. Recommendations for application of the findings and for further research are listed. Various tables and guidelines for a final report are appended. (BC)

ED053278

TAMPA FEDERAL OFFENDER REHABILITATION PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

VT010923

A RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
TO STUDY METHODS OF REHABILITATING FEDERAL OFFENDERS

MARCH 1969

MAJOR FINDINGS

Rehabilitation counseling and supportive services are effective in rehabilitating the Federal offender. The following findings collected during the experiences of the Tampa project may be helpful to counselors and other personnel in agencies applying the rehabilitation philosophy and process to Federal offenders.

1. The Rehabilitation counselor will find enthusiastic reception from the dedicated personnel in the Federal Offices of Probation and Parole.
2. Our experience endorses a professional team approach to the complex solutions needed in the process of rehabilitating the offender.
3. The full range of rehabilitation services is required to help the offender. No particular grouping or clustering of services was identified as being particularly effective.
4. The client sees his needs as urgent, vital, and immediate; and because of his inability to satisfy these needs from his own resources he must have an early demonstration of help from the counselor.
5. Initial client attitudes include: distrust of authority, non-acceptance of the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor as a helping person, and view of counselor help as disguised coercion and concealed authoritarian intrusion into his private affairs.
6. The counselor must understand that the offender tries to manipulate, con, and engineer relationships and regulations to satisfy immediate needs at the expense of more constructive long range goals.
7. In addition to poor emotional and psychological control, the client has minimal education, training, and salable work skills to survive in a highly competitive social environment.
8. A firm, realistic environment of considerable structure is needed for a given period of time following institutional release for transition and readjustment to social responsibilities.
9. Routine rehabilitation client processing is inappropriate. A behind-the-desk approach will not be effective. Instead, the counselor must have considerable time flexibility and be able to intervene in person with the client as required during crisis periods.
10. A greater time investment is required by the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor in establishing a meaningful communication with this type of client.
11. A continuity of planning for the offender is required between the corrections institution and the community. Such transition is often difficult because of the apparent minimal rehabilitation philosophy operating within institutions.
12. All offenders will not respond to rehabilitation and selective screening procedures are required.
13. A Vocational Rehabilitation counselor needs special preparation and training to work in this area. An internship covering the entire correctional process should be required to expose him to things "as they really are."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053278

TAMPA

FEDERAL OFFENDER REHABILITATION

FINAL REPORT

A Research and Demonstration Project to Study Techniques and Methods of Rehabilitating Federal Offenders in the State of Florida

KYLE M. TALLANT, PROJECT DIRECTOR
and
DISTRICT DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
FLORIDA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Sponsored By

THE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
FLORIDA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
CRAIG MILLS, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

March, 1969

This project was supported in part by Research and Demonstration Grant Number RD-2186-G from the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201.

PREFACE

Members of the staff of the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation have appreciated the opportunity of being a part of this national project to study the effectiveness of Vocational Rehabilitation in serving people who are job-handicapped as a result of being Federal offenders.

As a result of our participation in this project we feel that we have gained much from the cooperative working relationships with the project staff, the United States Probation Officers, the program consultants, and the clients as well. We know that this research will assist us in our efforts to serve other public offenders and we hope that it will be of use to many others throughout the country.

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Kyle M. Tallant, Project Director

Stephen J. Mazurek, Project Counselor

Eunice Laughinghouse, Project Secretary

Executive Committee

Kyle M. Tallant, Project Director

Stephen J. Mazurek, Project Counselor

Robert F. Evans, Chief U. S. Probation Officer

Charles M. Grigg, Ph.D., Research Consultant

Calvin M. Pinkard, Jr., Ph.D., Projector Observer

Zack Russ, Jr., M.D., Project Psychiatrist

State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Liaison Officer — Executive Committee

William J. Miller, Director, Rehabilitation Facilities and Workshops, Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose and Rationale of Project	1
	Setting	2
II.	METHODOLOGY	3
	Population and Sample	3
	Data Collection	4
	Treatment Procedure	5
	Continuation Grant Requests and Final Report Procedures	6
III.	RESULTS	7
	Formal and Informal Relationships Within the Multi-Agency Group	7
	The Parent Agencies in Relation to F.O.R.	9
	Vocational Rehabilitation	9
	Probation/Parole	10
	Interaction Between Staff Members	10
	Relationship Between VRC and his Parent Agency	13
	The Client, His Needs, and His Treatment	15
IV.	IMPLICATIONS FOR CHANGE	17
	Change Necessary in Agencies	17
	Implementation of Change	18
V.	SUMMARY	19
	Recommendations	20
VI.	APPENDICES	

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background Information

This is a report of the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Research and Demonstration Project conducted in the State of Florida by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in collaboration with the Middle Florida District Probation and Parole Office located in Tampa, Florida. This report covers a three year period beginning on 1 March, 1966 and ending on 28 February, 1969.

This project is part of a collaborative research study conducted within seven separate states in six RSA regions as part of an overall Federal Offenders Rehabilitation collaborative research program. A program office was established in Seattle, Washington, to administer and coordinate the activities of eight satellite projects. The states participating within this program were: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, Metropolitan areas selected as project operational sites within the above states were: Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Pittsburg, San Antonio, Seattle, Springfield, and Tampa. The state of Illinois had an additional operational project for female offenders which accounted for the eight projects within the seven respective states.

This report describes the day-to-day experiences of the personnel of the Tampa project and does not include detailed statistical reporting and/or comparisons with other projects within the overall program. Detailed analysis and statistical data are being published in a final overall program report by the Research Director in Seattle, Washington, and should be available for publication in a series of monographs late in 1969.

B. Purpose and Rationale of Project

1. The major purpose of the project was to establish in a number of rehabilitation offices a program of vocational services in conjunction with existing probation, parole, and correctional facilities and to assess the impact of this collaborative effort on both clients and agency personnel. The program was aimed at maximum utilization of vocational rehabilitation services for Federal offenders. Participating agencies included the Bureau of Prisons, Probation and Parole Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration, and selected state agencies affiliated with RSA.

2. Specific objectives of the project were:

   a. To determine the needs of Federal offenders for vocational rehabilitation services according to their physical, mental, and/or social handicaps.

   b. To provide intensive vocational rehabilitation services to Federal offenders who have been randomly assigned to demonstration groups.

c. To develop measures of success of intensive versus current services in the vocational rehabilitation of Federal offenders.

d. To develop related studies and take advantage of research opportunities as they appeared in data collection and data analysis.

e. To study the impact upon the attitudes and practices of the professional staff in various agencies involved in the correctional process as a result of providing intensive rehabilitation services to Federal offenders.

f. To develop recommendations of changes in administrative procedures and public laws relating to the correctional and rehabilitation fields.

The Tampa project was conducted under PLAN "A." Monitoring began as soon as case files were received at the Federal probation office. Cases included eligible probationers and releasees only; no pre-sentence cases were included. The vocational rehabilitation counselor reviewed each case as soon as the file was received in the probation office in order to make an initial classification as to whether an offender would benefit, or would not benefit, through the provision of rehabilitation services. Without collaboration with the rehabilitation counselor, the probation officer would also make an initial classification based on a tentative judgment of success or failure of the offender's parole or probation. Based on the above initial impressions a weekly list was mailed to the program office in Seattle for random selection and assignment into one of the three research categories.

C. Setting

The State of Florida's participation in the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program was centered around the Tampa Bay area located in the central Gulf Coast area on the west coast of the state. The city of Tampa was selected as the project location primarily because of the availability of a common site for the two collaborating agencies. Secondly, this area is a major population center of the state from which a sample Federal offender population could be drawn.

The collaborating agencies in the Tampa project were the U. S. Probation and Parole Office having jurisdiction over the Middle District of Florida consisting of 15 counties, and the Tampa District of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation consisting of 3 counties in the Tampa Bay area.

The U. S. Probation and Parole Office in Tampa is headquarters for probation and parole supervision for the Federal offender in the Tampa, Orlando, and Fort Myers division of the Middle District of Florida.

The area served by the Tampa and Orlando Probation Officers includes: Seminole and Brevard Counties (Cape Kennedy and the Missle Complex) on the North and East, down to Lee County (Fort Myers) on the Southwestern coast of Florida. Only seven of these counties — Hernando, Hillsborough, Pasco,

Manatee, Pinellas, Polk, and Sarasota — were designated for the Tampa FOR Project. According to the 1966 census, these counties have a population of 1,350,000.

The Tampa District of the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation employs 32 counselors and serves three counties with a combined population of 492,000. In addition to the general program, the Tampa District also has counselors located in the state tuberculosis hospital in Tampa, in a sheltered workshop and training center for the handicapped and has a comprehensive program for handicapped youngsters in the public school system.

Originally, the rehabilitation counselor assigned to the Federal Offenders Project received referrals from only three counties. These were Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Polk. Since referrals from these counties were slow in developing, four additional counties — Hernando, Pasco, Manatee, and Sarasota — were assigned in September 1966. The objective was to reach and maintain a maximum of 50 active clients throughout the three year period designated for the project.

Although the Tampa District had primary responsibility for the FOR program, a close working relationship was maintained with the other Division of Vocational Rehabilitation districts having jurisdiction over the counties involved.

Out of a population of 1,350,000, over one million live in large urban areas and less than 200,000 live in rural districts. About 85 per cent of the Federal offender clients referred to the project lived in the urban areas.

At the beginning of the project, the FOR office was located in the same building, but separate from, the Probation and Parole Office. After the first year, however, larger quarters were available and the two offices were combined in one area.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. The program director and his research staff located in Seattle, Washington, have the primary responsibility for data collection and analysis and will publish their findings in a Final Program Report at a later date. The responsibility of each satellite project was to collect and forward the data requested by the program research director and to carry out the field experimental operation. Only the Intensive Group out of the population selected received rehabilitation services.

B. Population and Sample

1. Description of Population

The purpose of the collaborative research study was to test and demonstrate the effects of providing intensive vocational rehabilitation services

to Federal offenders at specified steps in the correctional process. Clients for the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation program were offenders who, because of physical or mental handicaps, were eligible for vocational rehabilitation services under Federal-State criteria. In addition, the program offered services to those with social handicaps who were not otherwise eligible.

2. Selection Procedure

The Tampa project operated under Plan A. Monitoring began as soon as the case was received at the Probation Office. Cases included eligible probationers and releasees only; no pre-sentence cases were included. The rehabilitation counselor reviewed the case as soon as it was received and made the initial classification, all males, ages 16 to 55, residing in the designated seven counties of this project, were considered eligible, with the exception of aliens. Clients were randomly divided into demonstration and control groups.

3. Description of Sample

Since the project's initiation in Tampa on 1 March 1966, 450 Federal offenders have been processed as possible participants in the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Project. According to criteria established in the program research design, 203 of these were eliminated for various reasons such as: age, commuting distance, sex (males only were accepted in the Tampa project), expiration dates, or were eliminated as aliens.

By random selection, determined in Seattle, those found eligible to participate were assigned as follows:

INTENSIVE	76
CONTROL I	76
CONTROL II	76
TOTAL	247

Age distribution of the 247 ranged from age 17 to 53. Additional characteristics of the sample population are presented in Tables 1-18 in the Appendix of this report.

C. Data Collection

The project director supervised the collection of the data required by the program research director. The Vocational Rehabilitation counselor, or the secretary under the direction of the counselor, administered questionnaires to those offenders selected to participate in the research program. Relevant information was obtained from the files of the Probation and Parole Office, including FBI records where available, and sent to the program director's research staff.

Questionnaires were scheduled according to criteria outlined for each group; follow-up was assigned to the VR secretary. Number of questionnaires and required intervals were designated by the program research director and were given to each individual upon assignment to the project, then at intervals of 9 weeks, 9 months, and 2 years after assignment.

In addition, an effort was made to obtain such information as: number of days at work, number of job changes, financial income earned through work, arrests, and days in jail and any other law violations in order to establish a performance record of the individual. In some cases this information was available from the probationer's or parolee's mandatory report to his probation officer; in other cases (when probation or parole terms expired) information was obtained through personal contact with the VR counselor. Form letters were used where personal contact was difficult. The percentage of questionnaires returned was high in the beginning of the project but dropped considerably with the passing of time. A higher percentage of questionnaires was returned by the Intensive Group than the Control Groups.

D. Treatment Procedure

Casework processing was initiated when the offender made his mandatory contact for supervision under probation or parole to the Federal Probation Office. The initial research questionnaires were administered to the individual with a brief explanation that the offender was selected to participate in a research and demonstration. It was explained that further assignment to specific categories in the research design would be made by the research director in Seattle and if the offender were assigned to the Intensive Group he would be contacted by the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor. At this time a detailed explanation of the purpose and function of the project was given, the variety of services available made known, and the client was offered an opportunity to participate in the program. Offenders assigned to the control categories only were informed that research questionnaires would be solicited on a periodic basis and that participation and cooperation were encouraged.

The rehabilitation counselor made it clear to each individual that no authority or coercion would be used to force any individual to participate in the project. Each Federal Probation and Parole Officer encouraged each client to participate but, again, the condition was not made mandatory.

Except for the above preliminaries required by the research design of the overall program, standard casework processings as developed over the years by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation was applied. Necessary interviews, testing, evaluation, plan development, provision of services based on individual need and circumstances, counseling, and guidance were initiated for each individual expressing a felt need for vocational rehabilitation services being offered.

A useful exception in working with the public offender versus the ordinary VR client was the availability of considerable background information – such as a complete social history, education, work experience, convictions, incarcerations, institutional progress reports, psychological, aptitude, and psychiatric testing — on which to base preliminary decisions on how to proceed with an individual case.

Ordinarily, it was the objective of the rehabilitation counselor to provide the full range of all necessary services including, but not limited to, administration, counseling and guidance, physical restoration, maintenance during rehabili-

tation, placement and follow-up, and any other services to the extent necessary to achieve social and vocational rehabilitation.

As a Plan "A" project, a cross-section of services offered in Tampa included: provision of general medical examinations, internist studies for needed provision of surgery or treatment, dental services, optical evaluations and corrective services, psychiatric and psychological evaluations, psychiatric treatment for the individual, or the individual and family; medical assistance to family members where indicated; special education, college education, skill and craft training in technical and adult training facilities; equvalency examinations for obtaining high school diplomas, on-the-job training and special placement as indicated by individual client limitations.

Case processing and rehabilitation plan development was pursued in accordance with general policy and methods established for each participating agency. In the Tampa Plan "A" project this involved the Federal Probation and Parole Office and the District Office of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Initially, there was a minimum of overlap regarding each agency's area of responsibility. The probation officer was primarily concerned with the proper supervision of the offender as required by law; while the vocational rehabilitation counselor was almost solely responsible for the provision of services and the development of a suitable rehabilitation plan based on an offender's expressed needs, supported by testing and evaluation where indicated, and the client's willingness to pursue a specific plan. Since parole and probation supervision is closely prescribed by the courts, it was necessary to maintain close liaison between the counselor and the probation officer so that no violation resulted on the part of the client (offender) as a result of cooperation with the rehabilitation counselor. This developed into closer coordination and cooperation on the part of both agency staffs and promoted greater understanding of inter-agency operations. Most important, perhaps, was the development of genuine interest in mutual problems, common goals, and a team spirit. Motivation to pursue beneficial alternatives for a client's rehabilitation became inter-agency concerns. The Vocational Rehabilitation counselor in this project benefited from the close association with an extremely capable and dedicated Chief U. S. Probation Officer and his competent staff. It cannot be overemphasized that the lines of communication are a vital link in an inter-agency effort of this type and frequent personal contact is the most effective in promoting close cooperation and resolution of common objectives.

E. Continuation Grant Requests and Final Report Procedures

When a project is approved for more than one year of support, the Rehabilitation Services Administration will notify the grantee when to submit a continuation grant application and will provide a supply of forms. A short progress report must accompany the application. The progress report should include: comments on adherence to methodology, a summary of cases, along with status report, form 66-4, any major budget changes, special problems with their resolutions, a report from the Executive Committee; and any pertinent

comments the project director feels will lead to an understanding of this particular project.

At the time the award for the terminating grant is made, the project director will be provided a guide covering the preparation of final reports and related requirements. It is his responsibility to see that both the Continuation Grant requests and the Final Report are prepared in accordance with the guidelines and submitted to the Rehabilitation Services Administration to meet the required deadlines.

III. RESULTS

A. Formal and Informal Relationships Within Multi-Agency Group

1. The responsibility for the project was assigned to the Tampa District Director (District II) of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in addition to his full-time responsibilities for ongoing regular and special programs in rehabilitation within the district. He wore an additional hat as Project Director in the program.

Hindsight would indicate that the project could have absorbed the full time and energy of a project director without any additional responsibilities. Although full and enthusiastic participation was given by the Chief U. S. Probation Officer and his staff, the basic responsibility for the conduct of the project remained with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Florida State Department of Education.

The Florida project staff did not participate in the initial program planning and because of this, the program office in Seattle initiated and guided the establishment of the project in Tampa. Tampa was chosen to replace Raleigh, N. C., the original project site selected in the early program planning because North Carolina was unable to participate in the program.

Once the philosophy of the program and the operational procedures were established, except for special requests and adherence to methodology required by the program, reliance on the program office became minimal.

2. Guidelines and specific instructions were provided to each participating agency. In the Tampa project this included the Federal Probation and Parole Office and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Office; and since specific instructions were provided by the program office, no real need existed for a formal written agreement on the local level. Informal meetings and discussions were used to resolve any minor situations or questions, if any, and there was virtually no conflict arising from the role and function of each agency at this level. Although a formal written agreement was discussed in the beginning, the need for such a formality did not materialize in the day-to-day operations during the project.

If, as the final results and recommendations of the program will very likely indicate, an ongoing rehabilitation program for the offender is to be continued; simple local agreements of cooperation will prove useful in delineating the basic roles and functions of participating agencies, whether State or Federal. An Outline for Interagency Agreements is shown in the Appendix.

3. Since timely provision of services meaningful to the offender began to appear early in the project as an important factor in dealing with this type of personality, the State VR office delegated the authority for prior approval and general state policy limitations to the Project Director and the F.O.R. Counselor. An earlier attempt to follow usual VR procedures regarding prior approval of certain plans, approval by supervising counselors, etc., did not suit the immediacy of initiating meaningful services to the client. In almost all of the cases the VR counselor had considerable autonomy. Understanding and cooperation by the State VR office freed the VR counselor from most of the usual limitations that were not actually mandatory by law. These arrangements meant that the counselor could proceed with services on an immediate basis, which is so often necessary with the offender. There was no maximum ceiling on expenditures or type of service provided for any client who elected to participate in the project.

4. The project had a functioning executive committee composed of the Project Director, Project Counselor (VR), Research Consultant, Project Observer, Chief U. S. Probation Officer, and Project Psychiatrist. The meetings were held once a month in the office of the Chief U. S. Probation Officer since he is subject to call by the Federal judges for consultation at any time.

The Project Director served as chairman, with the Project Counselor substituting during necessary absences. Agenda was planned by the VR Counselor and the Project Director before meeting; however, the discussion was informal and the agenda was modified as the meeting progressed.

5. The status of Intensive cases was usually reviewed as part of the agenda and some of the more difficult cases were discussed in detail for possible solutions or recommendations by the committee for continued case processing and development.

In one important aspect the executive committee functioned as a forum for the VR counselor. He was able to verbalize his frustrations and disappointments concerning a given case, and members of the meeting representing different disciplines offered alternatives.

To a limited extent the meetings served as an information gathering and dissemination vehicle for the Project Consultant and the Project Observer whose responsibilities were to render required reports to the program office relating to the conduct of the Tampa project.

The overall effectiveness of the Executive Committee was discussed during the final meeting and members agreed that the effort was entirely worthwhile. There were expressions of regret that time did not permit any more detailed following of each Intensive case.

6. The general outcome is based on a cooperative working agreement between Vocational Rehabilitation and the Office of Probation and Parole. It is not possible to appraise the relative effectiveness of either of these agencies in describing the general outcome.

B. Parent Agencies in Relation to F.O.R.

1. Vocational Rehabilitation

As indicated earlier in this report the State Office of the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation gave the Project Director blanket approval to provide services to the F.O.R. clients based on client needs and reasonable rehabilitation planning. The only broad limitation was not to exceed available resources provided in the F.O.R. budget for any given grant period. Otherwise, no service was denied any offender participating in the F.O.R. project as long as there was availability of funds and the needed services contributed to the client's rehabilitation.

Under normal operation of its general program, the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation does not ration services to clients; services are provided on an as-needed basis. There are broad limits established on expenditures relating to a particular plan of services as part of general state policy (State Plan) limitations. This policy is flexible. With proper justification, services and additional expenditures which may be above the general policy limitations, but which may be required to complete a plan of rehabilitation initiated on any particular client, are routinely approved by the state office.

Reasonable production goals are encouraged but no rigid closure quota system is enforced by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Florida has always enjoyed a reputation as a progressive state. The diversity and richness of its citizenry have made important contributions to the state's forward looking philosophy and imaginative planning. Capable leadership by the State Director and his staff have kept the State of Florida in the forefront of pioneering new methods and programs to serve the physically disabled, the mentally ill, and the mentally retarded.

Serving the public offender presents a new challenge in the rehabilitation movement. Florida has been privileged by being selected to participate in this innovative research effort. This effort will help us find ways to get on with the job. The willingness and ability to participate can perhaps be best summarized in a statement by Mr. Craig Mills, State Director of DVR, given at a regional institute on the public offender in Tallahassee, when he said: "The size of the job seems to afford room to work on it by all who have a measure of help to give. Like most state rehabilitation directors, I think we have a responsibility to serve public offenders and am willing to do all I can to help meet this responsibility."*

*"How a State Director Views the Field of Rehabilitation of the Public Offender" by Craig Mills, Assistant Superintendent for Vocational Rehabilitation, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

2. Probation and Parole

In the Tampa project the Chief U. S. Probation Officer and his staff followed these generally established procedures:

Priority was given to pre-sentence investigation reports. Caseload supervision depended on the remaining time available.

Probationers and parolees report regularly to the probation office during a five-day period at the first of each month. The probation office usually stays open in the evening on the first Monday of each month in order to accommodate the clients who are required to report but who may be working. During these evenings the vocational rehabilitation counselor frequently arranged to see and interview the probationers and parolees who would become participants in the project.

Probation officers were instructed by the CUSPO to allocate supervision time to those individual probationers and parolees who had a more direct need for the services of the probation officer.

The probation officers consistently decried the fact that under the random selection process of the project design many individual probationers and parolees were denied intensive services; however, in no instance was there any variation in the matter of selecting those for intensive care. This was based solely on the random selection process. Probation officers in some instances felt that due to the project design, efforts were being expended on undeserving clients. Probation officers expressed themselves along these lines but at no time insisted that the project design be violated.

In no instance did conditions of supervision stand in the way of the VR counselor's plan with the exception of the fact that in a few cases probation officers gave travel authority to clients permitting them to go to other areas without clearing such change with the VR counselor in adva

A cooperative team relationship soon developed fostered by a resourceful and experienced Chief U. S. Probation Officer in the Tampa office. The attitude he has shown consistently throughout the project in terms of genuine interest and cooperation in achieving projectives has been contagious and shared by the key personnel in his office. A clear and close communications channel always existed between the two agency staffs. Mutual respect and a spirit of cooperation characterized the working relationship of the Tampa project F.O.R. staff.

C. Interaction Between Staff Members on Comparable Line Levels, Particularly Those Dealing Directly with the Client

The Tampa project involved the cooperation of the Federal Probation and Parole Office and the District Office of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. In attempting to distinguish between each agency's task, the traditional function of each needs to be considered.

1. The task of the Probation and Parole Officer is quite closely structured or circumscribed by the courts, judges, probation and parole boards, with little latitude or availability of resources to provide direct and tangible assistance and services which may be needed by a parolee or probationer to help hurdle some of the initial obstacles which may be facing his client. He sees himself as one whose purpose is to counsel, guide, and assist public offenders, yet at the same time requiring such persons to live within a framework of court-imposed or parole board restrictions; and as one whose main obligation is to concern himself with the protection of the public from law violators.

The State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and subsequently its vocational rehabilitation counselors, has operated on a much broader and unstructured scale over the years, enjoying considerable latitude and autonomy in decision making in dealing with the individual rehabilitation client. Although counseling and guidance are also the basic tools of the rehabilitation counselor, he has the advantage of having available to him considerable resources which have been developed and improved over the years with rehabilitation of the individual as the primary goal.

2. Philosophically both agencies are concerned with rehabilitation but in practice a considerable dichotomy exists. By the very nature of his approach and philosophy in relating to a client the counselor must assume the role of a friendly, helping, service oriented person if he is to establish a meaningful relationship with a client. A subjective opinion of the F.O.R. counselor at this point would be that the parolee or probationer views the probation officer as an authority figure, placed "on his back" by the courts as a punitive measure, and far from being a person interested in promoting a trustful and helping relationship, a person that he would rather have "off his back."

Because of the demands by the judges and the courts on the probation officer's time for lengthy pre-sentence investigations, etc., it is not feasible under the existing system to become too involved in purely rehabilitative efforts with any appreciable number of clients.

Case-loads permitting, if the same resources were available to the probation officer which the rehabilitation counselor has at his disposal, a doubly effective job of supervision and rehabilitation could be accomplished by one individual, the probation officer. Under existing conditions, however, close inter-agency cooperation is the most feasible approach. Other alternatives should be the addition of specialists in rehabilitation to existing probation and parole office staffs and making the same resources available to rehabilitate the public offender as those enjoyed by the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. This would no doubt require some appreciable duplication of effort along with some considerable staff personnel modification needs and requirements.

3. In the Tampa project there has been little feeling on the part of the Federal Probation Office staff that the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor represented any threat or encroachment on their authority, role, or management of the F.O.R. clients. There were some mutually shared feedings of frustration and apprehension concerning some of the ambiguous aspects of the F.O.R.

project, the methods to be employed, and the areas of responsibility in the cooperative effort. There developed a feeling of mutual sharing in appropriate ways, both on the part of the VR counselor and the Probation and Parole staff concerning a given case. There was give and take depending upon the particular needs of the client at a particular point in time. Would a client benefit from surgery? Would another function more effectively being self-employed? Would another benefit from higher education such as high school or college? Would psychotherapy be effective with another? Would still others benefit from specific types of training? As a result, there developed an increasing recognition on the part of the Probation and Parole staff about appropriate ways to involve the VR counselor in various cases.

In the opinion of the Tampa F.O.R. project staff a cooperative agreement and a close working relationship with both Federal and State Correctional, Probation and Parole agencies would provide the public offender with services which can be made available through existing Divisions of Vocational Rehabilitation by providing additional counselor personnel to specialize in the public offender field. Since case service funds would need to be increased for this type of undertaking, an increase in matching funds to the states from the Federal Government is strongly indicated, if not a total commitment (100%) of funds required by the states to help reduce crime and recidivism throughout the country.

Correctional staff members are not concerned by whom the VR counselor should be employed but feel that some preliminary agreement should be reached in decision making to prevent the possibility of conflicting instructions or advice being given clients.

4. As indicated earlier in this report, during the initial phase of the F.O.R. project in Tampa, case processing was begun on a very informal and unstructured basis. Each counterpart concentrated on his own area of responsibility with required supervision being the task of the probation officer while the rehabilitation counselor almost solely took on the task of developing a feasible plan of rehabilitation. Basically, the counselor accepted a given client as a referral and then followed a fairly routine case development process. Informal contact was maintained with the supervising probation officer concerned and no structured system of exchanging information was followed except when a question arose regarding a possible conflict of authority. It might have been advantageous for the VRC to be able to move a client from county to county, or city to city, in order to have closer contact and availability of the client for plan development, without knowing that special conditions of probation or parole prevented the client from exercising this type of mobility. This is one example of learning by the VRC and on which closer coordination was constantly being improved.

The complete file of a history of the offender was routinely available to the VRC and was included as part of the VRC case record on each F.O.R. client. There was no problem with mutual exchange of information of both corrections or rehabilitation records. Both records were accessible to either the VRC or the U. S. Probation Office concerned, as they were located in the same office. A Xerox machine, leased for the duration of the project, was available

to both staffs for copying documents of interest to either staff, and primarily to provide the Program Office in Seattle with required research data throughout the program.

The CUSPO scheduled monthly meetings for his staff, usually on the last Friday of each month. These were attended infrequently by the VRC due to scheduling problems and other routine matters required by the project. There was frequent daily contact, however, between all staff members. In addition, the monthly Executive Committee meetings made up for the VRC's absence from the scheduled meetings held by the Probation staff.

5. Since the supervision of an offender is quite strictly prescribed by the courts, the question of exercising veto power came up early in the project. It was determined that all case planning which resulted in a possible violation and departure from established requirements of supervision would be subject to a veto either by the CUSPO or the USPO responsible for the supervision of any F.O.R. client. The veto was not exercised during the operation of the F.O.R. project.

6. From the very beginning of the project little adjustment in the staff job definition was required. No major role conflicts developed. Minor conflicts were settled through frank and open discussions either between individuals or at the Executive Committee meetings.

D. Relationship Between VRC and His Parent Agency

1. The Vocational Rehabilitation counselor was housed in the suite of offices occupied by the U. S. Probation and Parole Office staff. This was consistent with the Program Plan as prescribed by the Seattle office. The original proposal called for the assignment of a VRC on a full-time basis to the Federal Probation office. This promoted daily and direct lines of communication between the VRC and the Probation office staff. This is also where direct contact with the offender was possible for initial and subsequent contacts. In addition, files of criminal records, incarcerations, and complete social histories were available to the VRC with which F.O.R. cases were initiated.

It became apparent quite early in the project that a neat scheduling of appointments from 8 to 5 was not feasible for this type of clientele as opposed to the regular DVR program. Contacts for initial interviews and further development had to be made predenominantly at night. Cases soon developed where the VRC would leave the office on call from a client faced with a crisis. Others may come in on weekends, so that Saturdays and Sundays soon worked themselves into the schedule. An attempt, and an attempt is all that it was, was made to keep the mornings for necessary paperwork and the afternoons and evenings for field work on Monday through Thursday; staff meetings at the District VR office on Friday morning, reviewing new case files for a weekly list of potentials required by Seattle for random assignment to the satellite project on Friday afternoons.

2. There was some feeling of isolation from customary rehabilitation information felt by the counselor although he did attend the staff meetings held at the Rehabilitation central office. There was a feeling that supervision was not as close because of the placement of the counselor in the corrections office physical location.

3. The VRC identified first with the F.O.R. client; consultants secondly; probation and parole staff in that order; and finally with VR colleagues. The time and place for swapping woes and successes was at the monthly Executive Committee meetings where the full cross-section composed of the Project Director, Chief U. S. Probation Officer, and the Project Consultants could contribute a receptive ear. The most encouraging and objective comments often generated from the consultants.

4. The Project Director provided supervision for the VRC on a regularly scheduled basis of at least one day per week, usually on each Friday concurrent with the District staff meeting and on call as needed by the VRC. He was also available for a full day each month during the Executive Committee meetings. A casework supervisor approved treatment procedures and plans developed by the VRC. This is the customary procedure of operation within a VR district.

5. By virtue of the innovative aspect of the project, the VRC was given considerable autonomy in fiscal matters relating to the F.O.R. clients, but was closely coordinated with the Project Director for final approval of rehabilitation plans submitted to the State office. Purse-string decisions and treatment decisions were closely coordinated with the Project Director and the VRC. Throughout the project the VRC has enjoyed almost total discretion in planning with and for the F.O.R. client in rehabilitation planning.

6. The VR counselor has found the Executive Committee to be his best ally when he wants agency approval for a new and perhaps radical case service.

7. The VRC brought to the project with him an attitude of experimental optimism about the rehabilitation of the offender and considerable patience and tolerance for the ambiguity imposed on a project of this type. General attributes should be a generous amount of common sense; an understanding by the counselor of the frames of mind, attitudes, weaknesses, strengths, etc., of offenders; a grasp of the fact that legal action is mandatory in certain cases although the client is involved in a VR program; comprehension of the fact that successful programs require fast action in most cases and that prolonged delays impede the chance of success; and the ability to establish effective communication with the individual. Human development, applicable areas of psychology, (the wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job), and a real concern for the welfare of the individual would seem to be some of the basic ingredients required in any rehabilitative enterprise.

Empirical exposure to various elements which foster and produce anti-social behavior should be a basic ingredient to which any staff person should be liberally exposed. A practicing, not an experimental sociologist would seem to fill this requirement. Selected offenders employed as aides might go far in filling the gap between a professionally-oriented staffer and a three-time loser.

On-the-job training should cover the entire correctional process beginning with the courts, pre-sentence investigations, etc., through incarceration, parole, etc. In-service training programs to keep abreast of new developments would be needed on a periodic basis. Inter-agency cooperation and coordination should be fostered throughout the program. This possibly could be accomplished through assignment for short terms with cooperating agencies for better understanding of each agency's philosophy and operation methods involved, and may be included as part of the required internship.

E. The Client, His Needs, and His Treatment

1. Since no analytical data is available, hindsight and subjective opinion based on personal contacts, observations, and experiences of the VRC will be used for this section of the report.

a. In 90% of the cases, an upgrading of educational level and vocational training were needed by the clients. Suitable shelter, food, clothing, and transportation was the pressing need of approximately 80% of the Intensive Group participating in the Tampa project. Financial resources was the basic ingredient needed to satisfy these needs. Experience in the project indicated that at least 50% of the Intensive clients possessed no skills to enable them to be gainfully employed beyond the minimal labor, lowest wage earning categories.

b. The needs are based on individual situations and are unique to each situation. No standardized approach emerges based on experience resulting from the project.

c. More precise evaluation would be feasible through a comprehensive evaluation center, where an individual or a family unit could be staffed and appropriate needs determined.

d. Spotting the primary needs was not part of the problem. The crux of the problem seemed to lie in the client's acceptance of the fact that change was indicated on his part to be able to cope with, manage, and resolve his problems.

e. Experience now seems to indicate accurate identification of needs of the sub-strata of the population to which the client has been exposed is extremely important; and unless awareness exists on the part of the worker (VRC,P.O.,etc.) of the client's concept of these needs, much good effort and planning is subject to preclude high degrees of success.

2. As with the client drawn from the general population, the public offender on an individual basis will require the full range of services which are traditionally provided by the Divisions of Vocational Rehabilitation. Traditional rehabilitation offerings include any diagnostic, training, or placement services that are helpful to the client. More concentration may be required in the psychological and psychiatric areas, with more frequent personal contact with each client for counseling and guidance. In a well developed public offender

program in a given community, group therapy sessions may be a productive tool. Training will no doubt continue to be the major rehabilitation effort in any ongoing program since a marketable skill or trade is one important reason why the offender fails to find his niche in the community.

3. Innovation is part of the daily stock-in-trade of the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor's use with any individual client. Routinely, therefore, evaluation of the client's assets, aptitudes, and abilities and improvisation on these qualities to enable the client to function at his greatest potential provide the greatest innovative challenge. Providing tutorial services in basic education for a selected number of intensive clients to enable them to qualify for training requiring minimum educational levels was tried as an innovative service in the project. Available Adult Education facilities were unable to provide the accelerated approach required. The clients were "paid" to go to school as part of the project. This proved to be an effective method of attaining and upgrading a client's educational level and over a short and concentrated period of time to enable the client to be employed as a trainee for skilled work rather than as a manual laborer.

Selected on-the-job training placement was practiced with the client who lacked formal basic education but who possessed a fair degree of native intelligence and could learn a trade through daily observation, exposure, and actually doing specific operations required for semi-skilled employment. Participation of a prospective employer willing to accept a prospective trainee and possible permanent employee was arranged by reimbursement to the trainer of a basic learning wage to the trainee from the F.O.R. project case service funds.

This method is effective with a selective client and is not a cure-all for all types of offenders but an innovative approach to a particular client's situation.

4. The following is a breakdown of total expenditures for case services:

CS-A (Diagnostic)	$ 4,095
CS-B (Treatment)	2,736
CS-C (Prosthetic)	7
CS-D (Hospitalization)	1,217
CS-E (Training)	9,889
CS-F (Maintenance)	14,911
CS-G (Occup. tools)	5,466
CS-H (Other)	3,942
Total	$42,263

5. In the Tampa project we were able to use our services as a "carrot" to get the client to follow through on some cases and, of course, we used the correctional staff to probe them and help motivate them towards following through on services. In addition, any hardship resulting from participation in the project was compensated for by reimbursement for time lost on a job or scheduling interviews, evaluations, testing, etc., strictly at the client's convenience and availability.

6. Being able to provide or compensate for basic financial needs has been the most effective method of encouraging participation. The results must be tangible and immediate to demonstrate to this type of client that "there is something in this for me." Assistance in meeting immediate and necessary bills for some served this purpose. Provision of clothing, tools and equipment needed for employment served this purpose for others.

7. It was very frustrating to the VRC to plan services with the client and then have him pull up stakes and leave without any notice. The client would also play the correctional officer against the VRC and in some cases get permission to leave the territory, and communications were not too clear with the VRC and the probation officer. The VRC struggled for approximately two years before he really became knowledgeable as to the personalities and peculiarities of these clients. It took this period of time to release some of his frustrations when a client was trained for a job and then would not follow through on this. However, the VRC felt this was definitely a part of his job.

8. The point of involvement of the VRC in the legal process cannot be clearly stated based on experience gained solely from this project. Seattle's Final Program Report may indicate more or less effective points of engagement of the VRC in the legal process. One may speculate, however, that the sooner the rehabilitation process is initiated the more effective it will be in the overall scheme of dealing with the public offender. A review of the many social case histories, institutional reports, and criminal records during the F.O.R. project seems to indicate that many individuals are in need of rehabilitation long before they become involved in the legal process as public offenders.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR CHANGE

A. Change Necessary in Agencies

The Tampa F.O.R. project involved the cooperation of only two agencies, the Middle Florida District U. S. Probation and Parole Office and the Tampa District Office of the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The following comments will be based on cooperative efforts and experience gained from this inter-agency participation in the F.O.R. project.

1. Half-way House facilities within a community are not now available but would be useful for pre-release and after release types of clients for reorientation periods into community life. These may also serve as a pre-incarceration facility in special cases where the severity of the offense may not warrant immediate or extended incarceration, possibly in cases of the younger first offender. With this type of facility available, initial housing needs would be resolved and a client in residence would readily be available for necessary evaluation, testing, and initial phases of rehabilitation planning. Such a facility could very likely be provided by the correctional counterpart since clients subject to the legal process would basically be involved.

Services for all types of clients could be provided, whether general referrals or public offenders, through the availability of comprehensive evaluation centers in the community. Professional staffing of the center with appropriate disciplines would provide the client with a thorough evaluation of basic needs on which sound rehabilitation planning could be initiated by the VR counselors involved. The availability of such a facility would not only benefit correctional rehabilitation but would also be of considerable value in determining rehabilitation potential in any type of client. Basically this would be a VR facility but the services should be fully available to any cooperating agency and its clients.

2. As stated earlier in this report, the most practical available solution for offering services necessary for the rehabilitation of the offender is inter-agency cooperation. Let each agency perform that part of the task for which it is best equipped and trained. Duplication of effort by either agency may accomplish the job but it would result in a costly and needless effort.

3. Refer to the Appendix to the Summary of Group Reports of the 1968 San Antonio F.O.R. Conference for a consensus relating to policy or law changes necessary for new services to be instituted.

4. A Vocational Rehabilitation counselor needs special preparation and training to work in this area. An internship covering the entire correctional process should be required to expose him to things "as they really are." In-service training programs are needed to learn about new developments. Inter-agency cooperation and coordination should be stressed throughout the program. This could be accomplished through assignments to cooperating agencies for a better understanding of that agency's philosophy and procedure. Additional comments concerning change may be found in the Summary of Group Reports in the Appendix.

5. A subjective response on the part of the Tampa project VRC as to what type of client was the most gratifying to work with is that the choice would fall to the socio-economically disadvantaged individual who because of circumstances not necessarily of his own choosing has not had the opportunities available to the average individual. These circumstances, unfortunately, are magnified in early childhood by broken homes, ghetto-type living conditions, and other highly detrimental type of living conditions such as lack of opportunity for decent schooling, etc.

B. Implementation of Change

1. The research findings represented in this report will be disseminated to all those agencies and agency representatives which cooperated in the project. The findings represented here will be utilize on a 'Statewide' basis as a substantial informational, educational, and staff training resource in molding various offender rehabilitation programs with State and local correctional rehabilitation agencies and organizations. More specifically, the utilization of the findings will take the form of a "cutting edge" in the development and implementation of the need for employing special rehabilitation services, methods of streamlining the

delivery of rehabilitation services, special programs in rehabilitation facilities and in-service staff training of the involved rehabilitation and correctional agency personnel. The utilization of these findings will also play a major role in the improvement and expansion of current program efforts to serve the offender in major institutions and local communities. The findings will also have an important utilization influence on the "communication and cooperative activities" of the agencies and agency representatives carrying out programs on behalf of the offender.

2. We expect the application of the findings will take a variety of forms that may best not be judged at this time to be "easy or difficult." Much will depend on the agency giving the time and attention needed to areas of greatest need which, for example, may be the selection and training of counselor staff to work with offenders and in offender rehabilitation programs. At the present time there is a vital need for this type of staff training and preparation. The in-service staff training programs and workshops will, however, include and employ many of the findings represented in this report. Another major area of importance is the application of these findings to support recommendations and suggestions for changes in the agencies program policies and regulations which may interrupt or delay the delivery of various rehabilitation services to the offender. Employment of many traditional methods in delivery of rehabilitation services to the offender group is often found to be inconsistent and incompatible to the constructive development of relationships and productive implementation of needed services. The changing of traditional methods in delivery of services to a more expedient system of procedures may not be so easy.

3. Each professional administrative and rehabilitation counselor staff person in the agency will receive a copy of the reports' findings. Particular emphasis and attention will be given to incorporating many of the findings into the agencies' current programs and activities dealing with the rehabilitation of the offender. More specific attention will be given to including the findings in staff training sessions and workshop programs that prepare counselor staff for this type of work.

V. *SUMMARY*

A. Summary

The District Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in Tampa has been involved in a three-year cooperative research project with the Middle Florida District Federal Probation and Parole Office. This project was part of a collaborative research and demonstration study conducted within seven states in six RSA regions designed to explore how rehabilitation techniques and supportive services could be helpful to Federal offenders.

Methodology in the Tampa project involved assigning a VR counselor on a full-time basis to the Federal Probation Office. He began working with probationers and releasees as soon as the case files were received in the probation

office. Different patterns of counselor intervention were followed in other parts of the nation according to a research design aimed toward discovering the most appropriate time to offer rehabilitation services to Federal offenders.

Experience in the Tampa project has demonstrated that as work continues with this category of client he loses his antagonistic and somewhat mythical hardness and emerges as an individual in need of help in many ways and worthy of concern by agencies and individuals for his unique value as a human being.

The rehabilitation process should be offered through a professional team approach because the complex solutions required exceed the problem solving ability of a single profession or agency. A full range of rehabilitation services is needed because the offender does show a wide diversity of need. A narrower cluster of services and treatment following a prescription approach will not be effective.

The client sees his needs as urgent, vital, and immediate; and because of his inability to satisfy these needs from his own resources he must have an early demonstration of help from the counselor. Distrust of authority and nonacceptance of the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor as a helping person are initial attitudes expressed by many clients. They often show poor emotional and psychological control and are usually equipped with minimal education, training, and salable work skills to survive in a highly competitive social environment. The counselor must understand that the offender tries to manipulate, con, and engineer relationships and regulations to satisfy immediate needs at the expense of more constructive long range goals. Considerable structure including half-way house placement is often helpful.

The Tampa project further demonstrates that the counselor must have considerable time flexibility and be able to intervene in person with the client as required during crisis periods. The offender is not emotionally equipped to tolerate the frustration of extended delays in service delivery and a "behind-the-desk" office approach by the counselor will be ineffective.

All offenders will not respond positively to rehabilitation. Selective screening is required for maximum economy of time and resources.

B. Recommendations

1. For Application of the Findings

The Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has recently been writing and publishing information concerning ideal rehabilitation service offerings for various types of clients. It is recommended that the experience gained from the Tampa project be incorporated in one of these publications dealing with the offender.

It is recommended that a forum approach be used to acquaint counselors in rehabilitation and corrections personnel in Florida with the findings of this project. Speakers could be provided to appear at various locations throughout the state of Florida to discuss project findings.

Articles are being prepared for dissemination of the research findings to the general public through the news media.

It is anticipated that the conclusions from this project will be incorporated by the District Offices of Vocational Rehabilitation as guidelines in initiating service offerings to the offender.

2. For Further Research

There is a critical need for extensive, carefully controlled research in the area of motivation of the offender.

Attitudes toward self, "significant others," and job adjustment factors should be studied and correlated with employment potential.

Ways to more effectively offer rehabilitation services to the offender through assistance programs to members of his family should be studied.

APPENDIX

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE POPULATION

TAMPA PROJECT

Table 1

REFERRAL AGE IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

	Mean Age	Number
Mean Age of Clients Participating	30.88	41
Mean Age of Clients Not Participating	29.46	35

Table 2

RACE IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

Race of Client Referred	White	Negro	Other
Number Participating	38	3	
Number Declining Service	32	2	1
Total Number Referred	70	5	1
Per Cent of All Referrals	92.1	6.6	1.3

Table 3

SEX OF OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

Number Participating	41 All Males
Number Declining Service	35 All Males
Per Cent Accepting Service	35.9

Table 4

MEAN GRADE ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

Clients	Participating & Non-Participating	
Mean Grade Achievement	9.56	9.91
College Graduates	1	0
High School Graduates	15	10
Completing 9th Grade	12	15
Completing 3-9 Grades	13	10

Table 5

MEAN GRADE ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO SUCCESS OF REHABILITATION

Mean Grade Achievement of Successful Clients	9.64
Mean Grade Achievement of Unsuccessful Clients	9.47

Table 6

NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION AND SUCCESS OF REHABILITATION

Number of Prior Convictions of Clients Participating	1.78
Number of Prior Convictions of Clients Not Participating	2.41
Number of Prior Convictions of Successful Clients	1.00
Number of Prior Convictions of Unsuccessful Clients	2.58

Table 7

LENGTH OF PRISON TERMS IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION AND SUCCESS OF REHABILITATION

Length of Prison Terms of Clients Participating	17.1	Months
Length of Prison Terms of Clients Not Participating	11.4	"
Length of Prison Term of Successful Clients	11.1	"
Length of Prison Term of Unsuccessful Clients	24.1	"

Table 8

PROBATION OR PAROLE TERM IN RELATION TO SUCCESS OF REHABILITATION

Length of Term of Successful Clients	31.1	Months
Length of Term of Unsuccessful Clients	25.1	"

Table 9

PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS OF PROJECT CLIENTS

	No.	*Per Cent*
Immature Personality	12	15.8
Situation Reaction	9	11.8
Sociopathic Personality	19	25.0
Personality Disorder	8	10.5
Passive-Aggressive Personality	3	4.0
Schizophrenia	3	4.0
Adjustment Problem	5	6.6
Inadequate Personality	7	9.2
Alcoholism	4	5.3
Passive-Dependent Personality	2	2.6
Anxiety Reaction	2	2.6
Psychoneurosis	2	2.6
Total Number Referrals	76	

Table 10

TYPE OF CRIME IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

	No. Accepting	*No. Declining*
Aid Prison Escape	1	0
Assault with Intent to Steal	1	0
Counterfeiting Offenses	1	3
Embezzlement: Bank; Union Funds	2	2
Forgery	3	1
Interstate Transportation of Forged Securities	1	0
I.C.C. Violation	1	0
I.R.L. (Liquor)	4	5
Interstate Transportation of Stolen Property	4	3
Possession Illegal Firearms; Violation National Firearms Act	1	1
Robbery	1	2
Selective Service Act Violation	1	1
Solicitation for Prostitution on Government Reservation	1	0
Theft—Government Property or Funds (Postal)	3	5
Illegal Wearing of Service Uniform	0	1
Marijuana Smuggling	2	0
I.R.L. (Income Tax Evasion)	1	0
Interstate Transportation Stolen Motor Vehicle	13	11
Total No. Participants	41	
Total No. Non-Participants		35

Table 11

NUMBER RECIDIVATING IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

Number Recidivating of Participating Clients	3
Number Recidivating of Non-Participating Clients	7

Table 12

MARITAL STATUS IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

Marital Status		*No. Accepting*	*No. Declining*
Single		16	8
Married		17	17
Divorced		6	5
Separated		2	5
Widowed		0	0
	No. Referred	*Percent of Ref.*	*Percent Accepting*
Single	24	31.6	66.6
Married	34	44.7	50.0
Divorced	11	14.5	54.5
Separated	7	9.2	28.6

Table 13

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN RELATION TO PARTICIPATION

No. of Children	*No. Accepting*	*No. Declining*	*No. Referred*
0	24	16	40
0	6	10	16
2	4	4	8
3	6	1	7
4	0	2	2
5	1	1	2
8	0	1	1

Table 14

PURCHASED SERVICES PROVIDED DURING THE DIAGNOSTIC STATUS AS AN EVALUATION DEVICE

Services Purchased	*Number*	*Percent*
Physical Restoration	20	26.3
Psychiatric Treatment	16	21.1
Training	17	22.4
Maintenance	17	22.4
Supplies & Equipment	7	9.2
Transportation	18	23.7
Placement	22	28.9
Other	7	9.2

Table 15

TRAINING FACILITIES UTILIZED

Facility	*Number Clients*
County Trade School	2
Business School	1
University	4
On-The-Job Training	2
Private Tutor	4
County Adult High School	2

Table 16

**EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF CLIENTS AT CLOSURE*

Employment Status	*Number*	*Percent*
Competitive Labor Market	14	18.4
Self-Employed	4	5.3
Student	3	4.0

**Note:* Approximately 20 of those classified as Participating refused to cooperate further after some initial diagnostic services; or, dropped from sight and did not complete planned services.

State of Washington

COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Olympia

SUMMARY OF GROUP REPORTS

Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program

Fourth Annual Conference

San Antonio, Texas

September 16-19, 1968

This program is supported in part by a Research & Demonstration Grant from the Division of Research Grants and Demonstrations, Social & Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Washington, D. C. 20201

Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program
Fourth Annual Conference
San Antonio, Texas
September 16-19, 1968

SUMMARY OF GROUP REPORTS

During the San Antonio Conferences, the participants were divided into five groups. Each of these groups worked up rather voluminous reports in answer to questions sent out prior to the Conference. The summary below is the F.O.R. Program staff's reaction to the reports, based on discussions which followed the presentation of these reports. Although in narrative form, the numbered statements may be considered as tentative staff recommendations.

Cooperative Effort

A common premise revealed in comments from the group and general meetings was that corrections and VR have a joint task in correctional rehabilitation. Because of this common task (1) a Federal committee should be established to act as a formal vehical for collaboration between the agencies, federal, state and local, with rehabilitation and correctional responsibilities. That these agencies would all require changes in philosophy, attitudes and policies was accepted.

On a local level, a corollary of the joint task premise is the premise that the rehabilitation and correctional staff should function as a team. (2) The team was seen as functioning even before referral, during the initial screening process. To illustrate the change in thinking involved here, one group noted those team members involved in institutional screening as the institution's caseworker, the *future* parole officer, and the VR counselor. They did not list simply staff from the agency making the referral and immediately responsible for the client. (3) The team concept was also seen as applicable in planning VR activities. If the client is to be released to an area beyond the original VR counselor's jurisdiction, the receiving VR counselor should become involved in the planning process. Throughout, the legal differences in the roles of team members were recognized and were expected to remain. It was also expected that these differences would be made known to the client.

Administration

(4) Concerning the administration of correctional rehabilitation programs, a cross agency administrative unit needs to be established which will allow the team to operate. The administrators should have a thorough familiarity with the

goals and purposes of the program. (5) Common case records should be kept and shared by the various agencies represented on the team. The records would travel with the client. (6) In the special case of federal offenders, 100% funds need to be provided to eliminate the problem of interstate referral, problems of third party matching, etc.

Staff

(7) As for the *team staff* itself, it was realized that special personnel need to be selected, persons who are tempermentally suited to work with the offender population. "The staff member needs the capacity to get indignant at the right point in his relationships with the client." "He must be willing to overcome the threat of genuine relationships and able not only to tolerate emotion, but occasionally to evoke it." (Quotations are drawn from group reports. Acknowlegements would only be confusing.) They will need to develop new skills and techniques in order to work with this client. (8) The development of short-term training institutes was suggested. These institutes should involve staff from both rehabilitation and corrections and should include subject matter specifically on correctional rehabilitation counseling. (9) As a further devise to prepare correctional rehabilitation staff members in in-service training, an internship or on-the-job training was suggested. In some cases, there should be an exchange of personnel between correctional and rehabilitation agencies.

(10) To keep the job manageable, small caseloads were recommended. (11) That advantage should be augmented by the use of counselor-aides and community volunteers. (12) Certainly in recruitment of staff, ex-offenders should receive serious consideration.

Clients

(13) It was agreed that rehabilitation agencies would have to accept the fact that with public offender clients, they will have "to stop waiting for the client to come see you." Also, VR eligibility will need to be updated. (14) There appears to be considerable support for a VR Amendment, making offenders eligible per se and services immediately available until decisions can be reached on need and the feasibility of a rehabilitation plan. Such a change would remove questions about the use of examinations to certify eligibility.

Counseling and Ancilliary Services

Counselors on the correctional rehabilitation team "should be seen as change agents, charged with the responsibility to change behavior patterns." This is a long range goal, but short range goals should also be considered. (15) "For example, a short range objective may mean provision of basic needs in an effort to stabilize a client's situation so that further planning may be developed." (16) Client goals should be considered in making an initial plan, i.e., the short range goal. (17) At all times, plans should be amendable, flexible and innovative.

(18) Necessary to any service with offender clients is immediate and tangible assistance. "When VR cannot provide immediate services, when needed, the

ability to serve the public offender will be quite limited. Administrators at both Federal and State levels are encouraged to review regulations which may, at present, prevent immediate services." Some of the services needed are (19) emergency case, (20) specialized counseling such as marital and financial counseling, and (21) legal assistance in civil matters, such as divorce proceedings. (22) Since the problems of many offender clients are intricately intertwined with those of other people, particularly family members, the 1968 VR Amendment, allowing service to the family as a unit, should be implemented.

Two basic types of facilities are needed: (23) pre-release guidance centers for inmates on work or school release and (24) voluntary halfway houses for releasees needing a supportive setting. (25) As for workshops and other facilities, existing facilities should be used to prevent further offender isolation from the community.

A word of caution is required here; offenders should not be placed with other specialized disability groups, such as the mentally retarded, when they will see this as further stigmatization.

In regard to any of the services rendered, the service "assumes significance only if it meets individual needs." The above seems to be implied in one description of counseling: counseling is effective when it manages to "communicate sustained concern for the client's struggles and a recognition of his unique value as a human being." Calling the approach, "action therapy" and describing it as immediate and persistent, the task is to provide services at the point of need and on a continuous basis, despite the frustration of interim failure, always striving to change the client's behavior patterns. "The minor problems of life should be satisfied in order to leave the client with the minimum of immediate preoccupation with which to occupy his mind and divert him from self-confrontation.

(26) With these kinds of objectives and problems, VR will need to reexamine its emphasis on closure.

Everyone recognized the magnitude of the correctional rehabilitation task. The whole job cannot be undertaken immediately. Some priorities as to who should be served will be necessary. These priorities should be established through research and the joint efforts of correctional and rehabilitation agencies. The choices will have to carefully avoid the selection of offender clients because they appear to be deserving or responsive. Both these criteria may well be myths.

The skeleton on which all these pieces can be hung was provided by one group: the necessary elements of an interagency agreement. (A copy of this outline is attached.)

OUTLINE FOR INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS

I. Introduction and Purpose
   - A. Title
   - B. Rationale for agreement
   - C. Epitome of agreement (who, what, when, where, and how)

II. Scope and Limitations

III. Administrative Procedures
   - A. Statement of statutory or legislative requirements
   - B. Statement of or the naming of the administrative heads responsible for implementation and advice of agreement
   - C. Statement of line staff directly charged with implementation of the agreement

IV. Financial Responsibilities
   - A. Interagency logistics
   - B. Client services

V. Vocational Rehabilitation Responsibility

VI. Corrections Responsibility

VII. Joint Responsibility
   - A. Team approach
   - B. Staff orientation, training and conferences
   - C. Exchange of confidential information with interagency continuity
   - D. Public relations
   - E. Records and reports

VIII. Eligibility Requirements

IX. Referral and Transfer Procedures

X. Review and Evaluation

XI. Statement of Compliance

HOW A STATE DIRECTOR VIEWS THE FIELD OF REHABILITATION OF THE PUBLIC OFFENDER

By

Craig Mills

Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Rehabilitation

State Department of Education

Tallahassee, Florida

All over the land today, those who are administering the State-Federal Programs of Vocational Rehabilitation are faced with the reality of being involved, or becoming involved in the national effort to rehabilitate the public offender and to help reduce the tremendous social problems of crime and delinquency.

This comes about because of the practical necessity of having to do something about an enormous problem. But it also comes about because the rehabilitation process has been uniquely successful with job-handicapped people —people with physical handicaps, such as tuberculosis and cancer, with mental retardation and with mental illness, all of which are stigma disabilities. While these problems are by no means solved, great progress has been made in developing a rehabilitation process which will enable these physically handicapped and mentally handicapped people—who are also job-handicapped—to get into the main stream of the world of work.

As the problems of our other job handicapped citizens have come so forceably to the public attention—those handicapped by illiteracy, poverty, cultural deprivation, or the stigma of being a public offender, people in many walks of life have looked to the rehabilitation movement for some help—the kind of thorough individual evaluation, careful personal planning; almost tailor-made solutions to fit individual needs at a level the individual can take; providing training at all levels, training tools and supplies, placement equipment, maintenance while training, transportation, surgery, hospitalization, hearing aids, braces or other appliances; the use of community resources, intense personal supervision, counseling and guidance, and follow-through with job placement— all these services would seem to serve the individual who is job handicapped for any reason—as well as they would the person who is job handicapped for physical or mental disability.

As this concept has gained recognition during the past several years, we have witnessed a series of developments and legal changes to help make this possible.

The most significant in terms of knowledge of how to rehabilitate public offenders probably would be the series of research and demonstration grant

projects which have taken place all over the country. These had a variety of sponsors in government and private groups, but the ones of special interest to us were those sponsored and funded by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration after the 1954 amendments. These took a variety of forms, involved a variety of agencies and professional groups, but generally brought to focus the individualized effort of the rehabilitation process in working with the public offenders. In various forms these research projects served federal offenders, state prison programs, juvenile offenders, probationers and parolees, alcoholic offenders, and in a few cases those involved in city or county jails. For most of these research projects, the traditional legal barriers of eligibility requirements could be set aside and people who were offenders could be served without the usual procedures necessary to establish their eligibility for Vocational Rehabilitation Service.

These efforts obtained varying degrees of success, but out of them came a fairly optimistic series of reports which indicated that with good staff training, with an adequate team of professionals, with real cooperation by all involved, a critically needed service could be performed effectively.

Next came a series of new laws from the Congress. In just the past four years we have seen the passage of PL 88-268 Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act Extension; PL 89-197 Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965; PL 89-178 Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act (1965) which amended the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to authorize grants to non-governmental agencies to pay part of the cost to carry out research and study of personnel, practices, and current and projected personnel needs in the field of corrective rehabilitation. It established the National Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower and Training. PL 89-176 The Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965, which provided for work release and other programs for Federal Offenders.

Mention should also be made of the 1965 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. While these amendments did not refer specifically to rehabilitation services for public offenders, the liberalized definition of disability made it possible to determine most offenders legally eligible for Vocational Rehabilitation. This definition of disability included behavioral disorders which caused a job handicap along with the traditional physical or mental disabilities which had been the basis of eligibility for Vocational Rehabilitation in the past.

These acts, plus the results of the Research and Demonstration projects, plus the proddings and insistance of people in the corrections field, have all caused people in rehabilitation, in general, and the State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation, in particular, to give a close look at this matter of serving offenders.

When we took such a look, what did we see? I'll try to give a general picture as I see it. This will not be a description of Florida alone, but a description of other states as I understand them. This is not intended in any way to reflect favorably or unfavorably on any state, any program, or any particular director.

Except for those states where research and demonstration grant programs had been conducted in the rehabilitation of public offenders, most state

rehabilitation agencies served only a selected few of the persons discharged from state or federal prisons. Generally these were amputees or obviously disabled persons who had to have an artificial limb, or brace or some prosthetic appliance in order to adjust to work upon leaving the prison. Most states had some sort of re regular or irregular system of contacts with the state prisons, there was an understanding about referring people and some states had formal written agreements which spelled out how the corrections program would work with vocational rehabilitation.

Most states did not have full-time staff people responsible for this function, unless they happened to have a Research and Demonstration project in corrections. If any state staff person had a designated responsibility for working with the corrections agencies, it was usually the person responsible for supervision of the basic rehabilitation program and he already had more assignments than he could carry out.

Most states had no counselors or state staff with professional training in corrections. Some may have had training in these fields as a part of a program in social work, psychology, sociology or rehabilitation counseling, but they were generally not employed as specialists in corrections rehabilitation.

Those states who did give some early emphasis to rehabilitation programs for offenders, generally did so by using their own experienced staff or by employing staff or consultants in psychiatry or psychology to make up their teams.

Some states had moved ahead to serve other discharged prisoners who were mentally retarded or who had emotional or mental problems. A few states were serving probationers and parolees on about the same basis, and others had moved into serving certain juvenile-offenders or young first-offenders.

It would be safe to say, I think, that prior to the 1965 amendments, practically no Vocational Rehabilitation program in the country had moved so far as to be serving a major segment of the offenders who might need vocational rehabilitation services. Indeed, it might be said that even now, there is hardly a state in which Vocational Rehabilitation has thrown open its doors to serve offenders on the same basis that they would any job-handicapped person with a physical or mental disability.

Some of the reasons for this are obvious. Others are more subtle and may be fruitful for our discussion during this institute. Again, I cannot claim to know how all Directors feel on this, I can only give my impression from discussion with so many of them. These may reflect some of my biases and prejudices, and may therefore, not be too valid. At first I thought I might list these in some order of priority. This became an impossible task and may not be too important anyway.

1. When approached on this subject in the past three years, since the passage of PL 89-333, most state directors of Vocational Rehabilitation would generally have indicated they had more referrals of job handicapped people with physical and mental disabilities than they could serve with the

staff and case service funds they had available. I know I said that many times.

Generally this was true. Although PL 89-333 changed the rates of federal matching funds to 75-25 and brought additional resources into most states, it happened at a time when most states had not been able to get increased state appropriations and their workloads had soared. Perhaps of more importance was the variety of new program emphasis coming out of PL 89-333 on workshops, facilities, statewide planning and a host of other things. Our attention was simply not focused on corrections or the rehabilitation of public offenders.

2. Second, and related to the first item, was the fear of being swamped with thousands of new referrals of a kind we were ill-prepared to serve. Many directors felt this might detract from services already underway for the known handicapped groups. With the staff and financial resources we had available, most of us knew that the best we could do immediately was to undertake some token steps with this new group of clients which would enable us to get some experience, to establish some relationships, to attract some professional staff members, and to make some plans to get more deeply involved. In fairness to every state director I talked with in 1966, I believe they all felt that the rehabilitation of public offenders would be given major emphasis in their Comprehensive Statewide Planning efforts which were to prepare a blueprint of the resources needed to serve all the eligible job-handicapped in the state by 1975.

3. Third, and maybe this should be first, was a frank fear of the unfamiliar. Other reasons might be stated as valid justification for not working with offenders, but underlying these surface justifications, I believe we would have to admit that many of us didn't understand the implications of working with prisoners or offenders and were fearful of it. Rehabilitation people wondered what this would do to our wholesome image of serving the handicapped, and whether this might cause employers and training agencies to lose confidence in us. We had faced this before when we first were given the legal right to serve the mentally ill, the mentally retarded and the alcoholic. And it took a great deal of in-service training, special institutes, staff development and staff experience in institutions to help overcome those fears and prejudices. It is normal to expect much of the same reaction to take place with services for offenders.

We have not yet had the benefit of all the vast amount of staff training and experience that probably will be coming our way in this area of the rehabilitation of the offender. Until then, the fear and hesitancy exists in any plans to rush ahead.

4. Closely connected with this stigma problem is the problem of administrative or legal barriers to employment or the securing of a license to practice by a public offender who has a certain kind of criminal record. Various kinds of governmental merit systems will discriminate against an individual with a past bad record, no matter what his recent years of experi-

ence may be. Many public boards and commissions require an individual to be of "good moral character" in order to be able to get a license to practice a trade or profession. Many businesses and corporations still have personnel policies which exclude certain offenders. These barriers are as real to public offenders as architectural barriers are to the physically handicapped. This probably points up the need for an intense public education program by the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, and all other interested groups to get better understanding and acceptance.

5. A fifth concern which many directors expressed was their difficulty in getting an understanding of just what was expected of Vocational Rehabilitation. This varied by states and depended upon the relationships that existed between Vocational Rehabilitation and the various other state agencies in the field of corrections. Most states apparently have several agencies dividing this responsibility although some seem to have more of the functions grouped under a single agency. But the pattern usually called for a State Prison Agency, a probation and parole agency, and a unit for handling juvenile offenders through a system of institutional training schools or a net-work of juvenile courts. The extent of state vs local involvement in the work with juveniles varied considerably.

The extent to which Vocational Rehabilitation might be asked to become involved depended considerably on the extent of the deveolpment of these various correctional programs in the states. Some had extensive educational and vocational training programs in their institutions, some had more elaborate systems of probation and parole; some had sophisticated evaluation and classification systems, and some had various programs for after care or on-going supervision for juveniles. But it probably would not be too unfair to say that the lack of all these was the general characteristic of most state correctional programs and still is. While a better public understanding is growing, these programs still have a hard time competing with other demands for the state tax dollar.

I cite these again, not to be critical, but because I think many rehabilitation programs had a major concern that rehabilitation would be asked to do things that might be the legal responsibility of the other agency and which might divert needed reabilitation resources from other handicapped people. Let me cite a few examples:

(a) In juvenile offender programs, many states, counties and cities had very few staff members, practically no community related facilities and inadequate programs to handle the load of juveniles coming before the courts or being returned from training schools. Most rehabilitation agencies had real concern that if they opened the doors to the referral of juvenile cases, that rehabilitation would become a juvenile counselor program and a system of probation and parole for juveniles.

(b) As the system of pre-sentence investigation, and probation came into more frequent use, Vocational Rehabilitation was called upon

to assist in giving comprehensive evaluation to some of these people. While such a comprehensive medical, social, educational, psychological and vocational evaluation was extremely valuable to the courts, rehabilitation people had a major concern as to whether they had a legal right or even a legal responsibility to expand professional time and case service resources on such cases, unless, at the onset it was known that the case might be a rehabilitation client. Even in such instances, there was confusion about rehabilitation duplicating the role and responsibility of the agency responsible for probation and parole.

(c) Similarly, there was confusion on the role of rehabilitation when called upon to assist in the pre-parole investigation or to develop plans for a prospective parolee who is still in prison. Unless this was a person with whom rehabilitation has worked and who wanted rehabilitation services on a continuing basis after being paroled, the rehabilitation agency had concern about getting into the area that is the professional responsibility of the parole agency.

(d) As the Research and Demonstration projects have developed across the country, some of these have provided for Vocational Rehabilitation to be involved in the prison intake, reception or classification system. This has had the advantage of identifying early those persons who could become rehabilitation clients. Thus, a joint plan for rehabilitation could be worked out by prison staff and rehabilitation staff and the time in prison could be spent to maximum advantage in getting physical defects corrected, or providing for remedial education or for specific job training. Such a program seems ideal, but many rehabilitation people have some concern about doing this on more than a Research and Demonstration project basis as it involves rehabilitation staff work on large numbers of prisoners who cannot be available for employment for several years. They may ask whether this is a function of the prison system or of rehabilitation, or of both. The public might say it doesn't matter who does it so long as the job is done and people are properly served. But in terms of use of limited rehabilitation resources, it does make a difference who does it. Perhaps if state legislatures were able and willing to appropriate sufficient funds for the state prison systems to provide these new programs, the prison system would prefer to develop them and handle them without the involvement of another agency. On the other hand, if the prison system is not going to be given the funds and staff to provide an after-discharge program, and if Vocational Rehabilitation is to have a responsibility for discharged prisoners, it is going to be necessary for Vocational Rehabilitation to be involved in the process prior to time of discharge and to be able to build areadiness for this event.

(e) Finally, most rehabilitation directors seem to feel, that if their agency is to play a major role in corrections, they need special training for staff members to do an adequate job. While key state staff members may be employed who understand the field of criminology

and corrections, these are in short supply. It may be possible to get supportive consultation from professionals in the correction field, but it would appear that a large measure of the rehabilitation work is going to have to be done by people with rehabilitation training and experience. Most of the Research and Demonstration projects have shown that while rehabilitation professionals have dealt with a wide variety of personality types and human problems, they have still been relatively unsophisticated in their ability to deal with the manipulative characteristics of the prison population. Most of us feel as we did when we began to serve the mentally ill and the mentally retarded that if we are to do a professional job, we are going to need every kind of staff training opportunity we can have developed. This means more than long-term graduate training programs. We'll need short-term orientation sessions and in-service institutes for staff members who will not be able to leave their regular work but who will be working with offenders part time or full time.

Summary

In this brief survey I've tried to cite some of the chief concerns and fears of rehabilitation agents as they try to determine the role of the rehabilitation movement and the role of their agency in their state in this challenging field of serving the public offender. While I have cited some of the questions we may have on legal responsibilities, agency roles, workloads and training, I think I would need to say one other important thing. We have never felt we were not wanted. The call for help has been genuine. The offers of cooperation have been sincere. The size of the job seems to afford room to work on it by all who have a measure of help to give. Like most state rehabilitation Directors, I think we have a responsibility to serve public offenders and am willing to do all I can to help meet this responsibility.

I hope that this institute will help us to find ways to get on with the job.

Coordinating Council for Occupational Education
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
August 2, 1968

P. O. Box 3126
Seattle, Washington
98114

MEMORANDUM

TO: All F.O.R. Project Personnel

FROM: Percy B. Bell, Program Director

RE: GUIDELINES FOR FINAL REPORT

The enclosed guidelines are to be used in preparing the final report which will be submitted to Washington, D. C., within thirty days following the close of your services to clients, February 28, 1968.

Prior to the San Antonio Conference, this material should be previewed and a very preliminary rough draft prepared. One person should be given the over-all responsibility for getting the job done. However, it is anticipated that you will have many of the project staff people involved in writing the report. Certainly, minority opinions should be included as well.

Purposes of this preliminary work are:

1) To give you a trial run on your final report.

2) To have material well enough in hand so that productive discussions may be held, not only with Program personnel, but with personnel from other projects during the San Antonio Conference.

3) To give Program personnel an opportunity to find out if there have been any serious omissions in the subjectives material to be used in interpreting objective data.

Since the projects have not been involved in the data analysis, we in the Program office saw project final reports as an opportunity to describe the projects' internal operations and their settings. We expect the answers to many of the questions to be subjective opinion; facts, as such, not being available.

Having tested out this format in the Seattle Program Executive Committee, we are well aware that some questions may mean different things to different people, and that other questions are difficult to answer without involving personalities. The ambiguities, we hope, can be clarified in San Antonio. As for the other difficulty, many problems attributed to personal differences are, in reality, attributable to job or role differences. The report should be carefully answered to reflect not personalities, but those differences in perspective that

may be a part of a job regardless of who holds it. To take a very simple example, one question asks, "Who are the members of the Executive Committee?" The members should not be named; their job titles should be given. Certainly, this problem can also be discussed further in San Antonio.

The name of the location of your project should be written above the title on the first page and on the upper right-hand corner of each following page. The outline should be followed meticulously, using the same numbers and letters as used in the guidelines to insure comparability. Any comments, special discussions or special studies, not listed in the guidelines, should be included as an appendix under Section VI. It is anticipated that this same outline, with possibly a few minor changes, will be used in preparing the final report.

With the exception of a few last minute changes, this report can be completed in the fall. A copy of this version of the report should be mailed to Seattle no later than January 1, 1969.

Your contributions in this report may be the most important part of the research program to date. I feel therefore, that this should be given your very close and careful attention.

PBB:ms

Enclosure–Guidelines for Final Report

FEDERAL OFFENDERS REHABILITATION PROJECT

Guidelines for Final Report

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Opening paragraphs, giving a little background information to make the purpose meaningful.

1. Origin of program.
2. Statement that your project is part of a larger one.
3. Origin of your involvement.
4. Dates of intensive service.

Be sure that in this section you make clear that this is collaborative research; that is, an interagency program as well as interstate, and one of several projects being conducted as a part of a single program design.

B. Purpose and Rationale of Project.

1. Presentation of general problem and concise statement of purpose of study.
2. Your project's particular objectives, to give specifically to purpose. For example, you's is a Plan B project, plus any aims your staff pursued, such as use of group counseling.

C. Setting

Brief description of *regular,* ongoing program in the relevant agencies; for example, in the Probation/Parole office and in the VR agency. This will provide a backdrop against which F.O.R. can be contrasted. Note that Section III, B., later in the report refers back to this section.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Opening paragraph, stating that Seattle Program Office is basically responsible for data collection and analysis, that your job was to collect the data they requested and to carry out the experimental operation. Refer readers to *final program report* for details on methodology procedures and for analytical discussion.

B. Population and Sample

1. *Brief* description of population (in the strictest sense, we do not have a sample, but only a population) to which results are meant to apply. In effect, there are three of these; one, technically the population is the federal offender; two, another population is the felon, regardless of sentencing jurisdiction; and, three, there is the socially handicapped client.
2. How clients were selected should be outlined. Give criteria for eligibility, etc.

3. Description of sample, giving number of intensive and contro clients in your project. By August 15, Seattle will supply you with information on age distributions, etc. that you can use here.

C. Data Collection (Analysis is Seattle's worry)
Description of how data were collected; who did the job, with what preparation; outline procedure for obtaining hard-to-get information. Seattle again will supply summary of percentage of questionnaires obtained, etc. This summary will not be available in final form until very late in your project's life.

D. Treatment Procedure
This should be a very brief description of the casework process generally followed by the counselor, including any cooperative efforts with his correctional counterpart. It might well be a summary chrono of some hypotheical average client, giving kinds of services offered, when and length of service. Innovation approaches could be interwoven into this narrative, but will be highlighted later.

E. Describe briefly the procedure followed in preparing continuation grant requests and final report.

III. RESULTS

Three general topics, all somewhat interrelated, will be covered in this chapter.

One, a description of interagency cooperation. What happens when more than one agency is involved in treating a single client?
Two, a description of the strains of innovating research: What happens when a part of an agency feels free to act beyond normal agency policy?
Three, a description of the growth experienced by all staff: What have we learned about the needs of these clients, staff needs, etc.?

You should finish with a composite picture of your project as it existed over time in relation to its component parts, to its parent agencies, to its clients. This section will be the only complete picture of the process and setting of F.O.R. It should be invaluable in interpreting client outcome after the Program Office has finished its statistical analysis. Below is the outline you should follow and the questions you should answer. You should always include more than one statement if the situation changed over time. Please bear in mind that I chose to call both the probation/parole offices and its officers, and the classification and parole offices and its staffers "correctional agency and staff." Although somewhat innacurate, it is less wordy.

A. Formal and Informal Relationships Within the Multi-Agency Group

1. Which agency assumed responsibility for the project; initially, later? How much did you rely on the Program Office for direction; initially, later?

2. How does your present agreement on service to offenders compare to what you initially expected? What caused the change? If you have a written (formal) agreement, how does it compare to the actual operation of the project?

Did your state VR agency make special financial arrangements, freeing F.O.R. from general policy limitations? What were these? Did these arrangements make a difference in operations? How?

4. Does your project have a functioning executive committee? If you don't, why not?
   a. Who are the members, regular and occasional?
   b. How often does the committee meet?
   c. Who serves as Chairman? Who serves when that person is gone?
   d. Is there an agenda? Does planning of the meetings occur prior to the meeting? Who participates in the planning?
   e. Where are the meetings held? Why there?
   f. How are the meetings conducted? By Robert's Rules of Order?
5. What has been the task of the executive committee?
   a. It is used for problem crisis solving—whose problems?
   b. Is it used for general administration?
   c. Is it used for case handling?
   d. Is it used for staff development?
   e. Is it used for socialization?
   f. Is it used for information gathering and dissemination? What information? To whom is it disseminated?
   g. Has the committee been worth the time and effort?
6. Which of the four federal agencies, as represented in your project, most affected the outcome How? Why?

B. The Parent Agencies in Relation to F.O.R.

1. Vocational Rehabilitation
   a. Although F.O.R. did not set limits on service or client selection other than F.O.R. eligibility and random assignment, were some offender clients declined certain services because of state or federal agency rules, such as financial need?
   b. Does your state VR ration services? On what basis are services rationed: available finances, cooperation of client, probability of success, availability of time? Were services to offenders rationed? On what basis were F.O.R. services rationed?
   c. Does your state VR have a "closure quota system?" Did it affect the F.O.R. VRC, indirectly? How?
   d. What qualities made your state VR agency a good choice for this sort of research? A strong state director? Liberal, broadly stated policies? Previous experience?

2. Probation/Parole
   a. How does your probation office allocate its time between supervision and presentence reports?
   b. Do probationers and parolees report to the office on a regular day of the week or at random? (Some offices set aside Monday, staying open in the evening for the purpose of seeing clients.) Was the VRC also scheduled to see clients at that time?
   c. Since no officer has enough supervision time to see all his clients, how is the time allocated? What clients get his attention? Did the officers expect the VRC to follow their criteria for choosing clients for whom real effort would be expected? How did they react if he served clients they thought were undeserving; not in need of attention?
   d. Did conditions of supervision such as non-association between offenders, stand in the way of the VRC's plans for clients? What conditions? Give examples.
   e. What qualities does your probation/parole office have that made it a good choice for the F.O.R. project? Officers with a good feeling about the job they do? Officers willing to leave the client to the VRC? A strong Chief whose orders are followed without question? A liberal judge?
3. Prison Classification and Parole Office
   The same questions apply here that apply to the Probation/Parole, excepted, should read "conditions of release; partial, such as work release, or complete, such as parole."

C. Interaction Between Staff Members on Comparable Line Levels, Particularly Those Dealing Directly with the Client.

1. How does the VR agency distinguish its task from that of the Probation/Parole Office (from that of the institution's Classification and Parole Office)? Vice versa?
2. How does the VRC operate differently than the probation/parole officer or the classification and parole officer? When the correctional staff member engages in treating the offender, does he approach the task with a different philosophy than that of the VRC? What tools, services, etc. does each have available to him? (This is really a compare and contrast question on multiple levels.)
3. How do correctional staff members react to the VRC?
   a. Does the VRC represent a threat to their authority?
   b. Does he represent a threat to the control of the client?
   c. Does the correctional staffer sharing a case with a VRC feel that he can use the VRC extensively?
   d. Do correctional staff members want the VRC to be employed by their agency or by VR?
4. How aware of VR case plans are the correctional staff members who also work on that case?

a. Do copies of VR case records go to the correctional staff? Do correctional staff records go to VRCs?
b. Did the VRC attend correctional staff meetings? Frequency, etc.?

5. If correctional staff are aware of case planning, do they exercise a veto power? Is concurrence necessary?
6. What adjustments between staff job definitions have occurred? Some tensions must have existed there, too. Did these get expressed? If role conflict was avoided or if you learned to avoid it, what mechanisms were used to do this?
7. In Plan C projects, what changes occurred in the VRC's method of operation when most of his clients were released?

D. Relationship Between VRC and his Parent Agency
1. Where was the VRC's office located? Why there? How much time was spent in the office, in the correctional agency's office, in the VR agency's regular office, in the field? (This will be an approximation, of course, and may have to be divided into different time periods.)
3. With whom does the VRC identify—his clients, corrections staff members, VR collegues, consultants? With whom does he swap woes and successes?
4. Does he have regular VR supervision? What VR person approves treatment procedures? Who controls purse-string decisions? Are pursestring decisions and treatment decisions coordinated?
5. How much discretion (freedom) does the VRC have? How much discrection will he exercise?
6. Whom has the VRC found to be his best ally when he wants agency approval for a new and, perhaps, radical case service? This ally may actually be people in several positions; it may even be people in different positions at different times.
7. What talents, experiences, etc. did your project's VRC bring to his job that have proved to be particularly valuable? In retrospect, what attributes does he think would have made his job easier? What attributes do other staffers think would help in dealing with offenders? What on-the-job training appears to be requried?

E. The Client, His Needs, and His Treatment
1. Using hindsight, list the *primary needs* of each intensive.
a. Summarize these needs for all clients for use in the report; for example, for 25% the most immediate problem was money, but after money was available, it became apparent that half of these needed some assistance in money management.
b. How can a counselor identify and evaluate these needs? Will standarized tests suffice?
c. Is it possible to evaluate more precisely? How?
d. What success did your project have in spotting these needs initially? (By the way, no-one was too good at it because the

client hid behind what he thought were acceptable or appropriate problems or behind what was his rationalization of the problem.)

e. Does an inaccurate initial identification of needs affect client success?

2. What services that VR traditionally offers are needed by offenders? What proportion of the offenders you served needed training, etc.?
3. What innovative services did you offer? What proportions of the clients needed each of these?
4. Give total expenditures for case services by traditional categories; i.e., hospitalization, training, etc. See Federal reports.
5. What mechanisms did you use to get the client to use services? Did the correctional staff assist here?
6. What kind of rewards, etc. were needed by the client before he would continue with the rehabilitation process?
7. What effect did it have on the client, on the counselor, when the client was unable to utilize what VR had provided; for example, get a job for which VR had trained him? Did the VRC see this as part of his job?
8. At what point in the legal process do you think the VRC should first get involved? After sentence in prison, only in the community, during pre-sentence, etc.?

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR CHANGE

A. Change Necessary in Agencies

1. What services might be a part of VR and/or corrections, that are not normally available now and that would be an asset to correctional rehabilitation?
2. Can VR, in combination with corrections, apart from corrections (choose one) offer the services necessary to rehabilitate offenders? Why? Are combinations of services required that VR or corrections cannot now provide What are these?
3. Would VR, corrections, policy and/or law have to change before the necessary new services could be instituted?
4. What changes would be required in personnel selection, in training, and in the coordination of multiple agency staffs?
5. Although the Seattle office will describe the client who benefits statistically from VR services, what kind of client did you find most gratifying to work with under these conditions? What client do you think offers VR the greatest chance for success, given a realistic appraisal of VR's potential? (Please specify your appraisal.)

B. Implementation of Change

1. How will research findings be utilized by your cooperating agencies?

2. How difficult will it be to apply these findings? Why will it be difficult or easy?
3. How will your findings be disseminated within your own agency?

V. SUMMARY

A. A good comprehensive summary should be included here, in order to pinpoint the important findings and highlight the most significant aspect of the project. This is particularly important for a project which has several facets.

B. Recommendations
1. For application of the findings.
2. For further research.

These also should be based on, and an outgrowth of, the project and its results. Particularly, it is not proper to include recommendations for research unrelated or only indirectly related to the study being reported.

VI. APPENDICES